

REMARKS**Summary of the Office Action**

Claims 1, 4, 5, 16, and 17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over admitted prior art in view of Furukawa et al. (US, 5,241,404).

Applicants wish to thank the Examiner for indicating that claims 11-12 and 15 are allowable, and that claims 2, 3, 6-10, and 18-21 contain allowable subject matter.

Summary of Response to the Office Action

Applicants have amended independent claims 1, 11, and 16 to further define the invention. Accordingly, claims 1-21 are presently pending for consideration.

Applicants respectfully submit concurrently herewith a Supplemental IDS including five Japanese references that were cited in a counterpart Japanese Patent application. Furthermore, Applicants have authorized the fee of \$180.00 for filing of the Supplemental IDS, as set forth in 37 C.F.R. §1.97(c).

All Claims Define Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 1, 4, 5, 16, and 17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over admitted prior art in view of Furukawa et al. (US, 5,241,404). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for at least the following reasons.

Independent claim 1, as amended, recites an image forming device, including in part, “a feeding part that is adapted to feed a copy at a plurality of feeding speeds,” and “noise detecting part that determines that the image data outputted by a specific reading part among said plurality of reading parts contains streaky noises regardless of the feeding speed.” Similarly, independent claim 16, as amended recites an image reading method, including in part, “a copy fed by a

feeding part that is adapted to feed the copy at a plurality of feeding speeds, comparing image data outputted by said plurality of reading parts regardless of the feeding speed.” Applicants respectfully submit that Furukawa et al. does not teach or suggest at least these combination of features recited by independent claims 1 and 16, as amended.

In contrast to the Applicants’ claimed invention, page 1 of Applicants’ Specification does not teach or suggest a feeding part adapted to feed a copy at a plurality of feeding speeds. In addition, Furukawa et al. at col. 5, lines 45-55, is completely silent with regard to detection and prevention of a stripe pattern when a copy feeding speed is changed. As instructed in MPEP §2143.03, “[t]o establish a prima facie obviousness of a claimed invention, all the claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art. *In re Royka*, 4980 F.2d 981, 180 USPQ 580 (CCPA 1974).”

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that Applicants’ disclosure and Furukawa et al. fail to teach or suggest at least the combination of features including “a feeding part,” “a plurality of reading parts,” and “a noise detecting part” as recited in independent claims 1 and 16. Thus, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of amended independent claim 1, under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn.

Furthermore, Applicants respectfully submit dependent claims 2-10 and 17-21 are allowable for at least the reasons discussed above with regard to independent claims 1 and 16 from which they depend, as well as the individual features each of dependent claims 2-10 and 16-21 recite.

CONCLUSION


In view of the foregoing remarks, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of this application, withdrawal of all rejections, and the timely allowance of all pending claims. Should the Examiner feel that there are any issues outstanding after consideration of this response, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicant's undersigned representative to expedite prosecution.

If there are any other fees due in connection with the filing of this response, please charge the fees to our Deposit Account No. 50-0310. If a fee is required for an extension of time under 37 C.R.R. § 1.136 not accounted for above, such an extension is requested and the fee should also be charged to our Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP

By:



David B. Hardy
Reg. No. 47,362

Dated: November 23, 2004

Customer No. 09629

MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP

1111 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.

Washington, D.C. 20004

Telephone: (202) 739-3000

Facsimile: (202) 739-3001